

# The Times Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY

Business Office: 100 N. Main Street  
 Richmond, Va. 22202  
 Petersburg Bureau: 100 N. Main Street  
 Lynchburg Bureau: 100 N. Main Street

By Mail: One Six Three One  
 Postage Paid: \$1.00  
 Daily with Sunday: \$1.00  
 Daily without Sunday: \$1.00  
 Sunday edition only: \$1.00  
 Weekly (Wednesday): \$1.00

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg: One Week  
 Daily with Sunday: \$1.00  
 Daily without Sunday: \$1.00  
 Sunday edition only: \$1.00

Entered January 27, 1906, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1911.

## THE GOVERNORS AND THE COURTS.

When the Governors at Spring Lake were getting ready the other day to mob the United States Supreme Court, there was one voice against the undertaking—that of Governor Kitchin, of North Carolina, who voted "No." according to The Sun, he said that he was in sympathy with the idea, that is, he protested against the encroachment of the Federal Courts upon the rights of the States; but he didn't believe the Governors' Conference should go beyond the purposes for which it was formed; and when the vote was taken on the appointment of a committee from the Conference to advise the Supreme Court what it should do with the decision of Judge Sanborn in the Minnesota rate cases, Governor Kitchin voted in the negative. That was the proper thing for him to have done. "The majority against him was 24 to 1," says the Greensboro Record. "This is Kitchin. There is no temerity about him. When he makes up his mind he will stick even if he sees he is going to be slaughtered." Pity there had not been more like him in the Conference at Spring Lake. There was old Gilchrist, of Florida, who said that his State did not need any help, did not think that the Supreme Court would let itself be "bulldozed," advised the Conference to sleep over the proposed action, and yet voted with the majority when the test came.

The Governors' Conference met on unexpectedly on Friday. Its next meeting will be held in Richmond. At an "experience meeting" before the adjournment at Spring Lake, Governor Tener, of Pennsylvania, suggested that a better name for the aggregation would be "The Ancient and Amalgamated Order of Governors—The Governors' Union." That is rather long; but it is taken for granted that the Order, or Union, will have a distinctive button and the initials "A. A. O. of G. U." would look well on the Jim Swinger coats of the members of the Union. We would suggest that the button be made of brass, the sign of assurance, and that the letters be put on in red enamel, the token of anarchy. The "A. A. O. of G. U." will also require a motto, and we would suggest a line from Goldsmith's "Deserted Village"—"A breath can make them, as a breath has made."

The Conference was upset and wandered into the "insidious vagary" to which it gave its almost unanimous approval under the inspiration of Governor Hadley, "Progressive Republican," of Missouri, aided and abetted by the violence of Governor Aldrich, also "Progressive Republican," of Nebraska, the breeding place, it would seem, of paramount issues and doubtful ventures. "The question was as to the right of the Federal Courts of minor jurisdiction to pass upon rates made by the railroads in the several States. The contention was that such interference on the part of the minor Federal Courts was in direct violation of the sovereignty of the States, as it had the effect of depriving the States of the control of their own internal commerce. 'If the right of regulation of the rates of transportation in interstate commerce shall be denied the several States,' said Governor Hadley, 'then there will be no right to fix interstate rates of transportation free from any supervision or regulation.'"

There is doubtless merit in that view; but it does not appear that the Governors went about the correction of the condition of which they made complaint in the right way, if it was their purpose to accomplish any substantial reform. What Governor Hadley said in a dignified, if not convincing way was milk and water, however, compared with the violence of Governor Aldrich, of Nebraska, who denounced the Courts, even the United States Supreme Court, for going into legislative business, and arrogating to themselves the authority that was vested in the several States; in Congress: "When Court decisions," he declared, "disturb and even override our entire scheme of government, it is time to call a halt and cast about ourselves for a remedy to check the usurpation that may in the near future develop into a galling tyranny if allowed to go on unchecked." With blood in his eye and determination in his voice, this Chief Magistrate of an altogether ridiculous State, declared, "Nebraska will respect courts and end court decisions, but it demands that court opinions stay within well marked lines and respect the sovereign power of the States. Let the Courts remember that tyranny in judicial ermine is as hideous as tyranny in a czar." That is exactly what we think and have said over and over again. It is what all unduly excited persons say in every campaign, and none can dispute it; but why it should have been said at the Governors' Confer-

ence, when the entire audience was made up of the same general material, we do not understand.

We particularly do not understand why Governor Emmet O'Neal, of Alabama, should have taken off his feet by the raving of the Governor from Nebraska, in view of his own very forcible declaration made only two days before, that "if a law is in violation of the Constitution, it is void, and the only remedy can be found in the Courts." Governor O'Neal has also expressed very plainly his view that "the jewel principle of our Republic is in the Federal Government's defining and limiting liberty through three co-ordinate powers—the same being the legislative, the executive and the judicial powers. Yet it was upon Governor O'Neal's motion that a committee of Governors was appointed 'to see,' as Governor Harmon has explained, 'that the States' side of this controversy is properly presented to the Supreme Court.' This is a most unusual proceeding, and if the Supreme Court should ask for the record to show how the Governors got into the controversy, so-called, the situation might be the least bit embarrassing. It would seem to be an entirely calm and dispassionate outlook that the Governors have magnified their office and have done for political purposes what should have been done only by the regular law officers of the several States, if done at all, in the light of reason.

## POPULARITY OF THE BIBLE.

It is often said that interest in the Bible is rare, that people are more and more likely to let dust accumulate on its pages. The investigations of Clayton Sedgwick Cooper, published in his new book, "The Bible and Modern Life," would seem to rebuke and refute this idea, and to establish the fact that the Bible is the most widely read book in the world.

Mr. Cooper tells of the work which is being done in modern Bible classes, not alone in this nation, but abroad, and gives many details which are of interest. The general public is unaware of how extensive this work is. Last year 23,011,194 people, representing fifty-one nationalities, were enrolled in Sunday schools in various countries. Twenty-seven Bible societies report an aggregate distribution for 1910 of 12,342,156 Bibles. One society alone prints the Bible in four hundred different languages.

## PRESIDENT DEXTER.

To George H. Dexter, President of the Washington and Lee University: Stay where you are. Remember Abercrombie. There's nothing in it for you or for the cause of higher education to which you have devoted your life. The place you fill now is a higher place. The field is larger. The opportunities are greater. There is much difference between being President of a great institution removed from political influences and an institution which is dependent upon the favor of succeeding shoals of politicians who may or may not be influenced by the true educational spirit. You have done a wonderful work at Lexington. The people of the community know you and like you. The board of trustees of the University have the utmost confidence in your leadership, and your student body respect and admire you for your manly character and sincere and helpful sympathy with them in their college life and ambitions. You have made a fine reputation in the educational world by your administration of your present exalted place. You could not leave the University which you have fostered without doing it serious injury. Stay where you are.

## AN ORTHODOX RABBI.

Wolf Margolies, for the last five years chief rabbi of the united Jewish congregations of Boston, has gone to New York to become rabbi of the United Hebrew Community of the great metropolis. He was greeted upon his arrival in Gotham by the thirty directors of the Community, and was conducted by them to the headquarters of the orthodox faith—stopped on the way at a three-story house in East Broadway which had been bought for a residence for him without his knowledge—where he was welcomed by five thousand of the people to whom he will be hereafter "a source of law and justice as well as religion." Ten years ago, as we are told by The Sun, a number of the orthodox Jews of New York, alarmed by the manner in which their children were drifting away from the customs and teachings of the laws of Moses, banded together to do what they could to combat this spirit of modernism. They have been striving faithfully to carry on their work, but they needed a leader in whose learning and wisdom and integrity they could trust, and they have found in Rabbi Margolies the chief priest whom they can follow, a man of notable talents, of deep piety, of thorough consecration to the law and testimony as laid down by the Great Lawgiver of Israel. In expressing his appreciation of the welcome extended to him, the learned Rabbi gave assurance that he would work in harmony with the other rabbis of the city and give battle to the spirit of modernism which has made such inroads upon the ancient faith in recent years, and declared that "America is as good as any other country for us to take a firm stand for our religion. The American spirit is the same as the orthodox Jewish spirit, so we are not compelled to choose between them. Let us all be faithful to both."

The Jewish population of the United States is estimated by the American Jewish Year-Book at 1,777,185. The religious census of 1906 shows that there were at that time 101,457 heads of families of Orthodox Jews,

with 1,769 organizations. Estimating five persons to the household, this would indicate that there are something over half a million of this ancient people who stand by the faith of the fathers and follow all the laws and ordinances divinely ordained for their guidance, and that there are more than a million who have allied themselves with the reformed congregations.

The fight Rabbi Margolies has undertaken appears to be a losing fight, but his courage and sincerity must be admired, and it is hoped that he and his assistant rabbis will have great success in their labors; whether we believe in the outworn creed and ordinances of Moses or not, the old faith is far better in some respects than the new. At least this is the opinion of many of the preachers and prophets of the Christian world.

## THE PEOPLE AND THE PLAY.

A play depends more directly upon the point of view of the public for its success than almost any other form of art. There is, for that reason, much discussion about the ability and inability of the public to judge a dramatic production on its merits.

Charles Klein in a recent interview said: "Given 1,000 people in a theatre, you will probably find only 100 who can think, the other 900 will be instinctive in their judgments. Most people are instinctive. They like a play or they dislike it, they cannot tell why. They like it or they dislike it without knowing circumstances into account. Very few people indeed take circumstances into account when judging of a character or a play. 'But the audience does not take the necessities of the case into account, and so by throwing the balance too much to one side the dramatist may have had inferior results. This instinctive quality of the audience also furnishes another of the playwright's difficulties. He must appeal to the 100 of his auditors who think and at the same time he must get hold of the 1,000 who know what they like, but can't tell you why.'"

In connection with this comment by Mr. Klein, it is worth while to note the attitude of the Drama League of Chicago, which has published a new course of study under the title of "Recent Successful Plays." In the introduction to this publication, Professor Clark, a member of the educational committee of the Drama League, says: "In France," says Sainte Beuve, 'the first consideration is not whether we are amused and pleased by a work of art or mind, nor is it whether we are touched by it. What we seek above all to learn is whether we are right in being amused by it and in applauding it. The following plays the committee has had in mind principally the needs of the beginner in the study of drama.'"

The feeling of Sainte Beuve, which defines also Mr. Klein's criticism, may be hard to instill into the average play-goer, but the fact that the Drama League deems it as fundamental, is significant of the position which this organization will assume toward its duty of instructing the public. The playhouse is essentially a democratic institution. It depends greatly for its existence upon the pleasures which the play-goer finds in the offerings presented there. It is, on that account, necessary to elevate the standard of the dramas offered by continually pleasing the public with better and better plays.

The weary business man and his companion go to the playhouse to be entertained. As the Des Moines Register put it, "If the analytical method of seeing a play does not detract from the pleasure of the proceedings, the pleasure-loving public will be glad to surrender its instinctive judgment for the more scholarly method." To encourage this view, however, in play-goers, the drama league and the playwrights must present more and more the affirmative side of their argument, and not hurt their influence by harping always on the plays that are mistakenly accepted as good by a public which does not discriminate.

## DOING WHAT WE CAN.

(Selected for The Times-Dispatch.) "She hath done what she could."—St. Mark xiv. 8.

The words of our text are one of the grandest things that could be said of any one if only it can be said with truth. Many long epitaphs full of praise and flattery make but poor reading, but happy are the people on whose tomb can be written with truth, they have done what they could.

The one to whom the text refers had not done so; one very wonderful thing, but she had done what she could; she had given Jesus the best she had. She made herself poorer for Christ's sake, and in so doing accumulated eternal riches for herself. She did not keep any of the precious ointment back or even the alabaster vase. She gave all to Jesus and kept none for self. What we lose for Christ is really our gain. That is what our Lord means when He says, "Whoever shall lose his life for My sake, shall find it." "She hath done what she could." This is what God expects of us. Perhaps we are not all capable of great things, but it is not the greatness of the act that counts, but the love and reverence that prompt it. The gospel does not say much about the great deeds of famous people, but there is a great deal about the loving acts of commonplace people, the cups of cold water given, the widow's mites and Mary's ointment. Jesus did not say, "Give Me thy wealth," but He did say, "Give Me thine heart." A man may give great sums to charities or preach wonderful sermons, and yet not give himself to God, but God says, "I seek not yours, but you."

Let us begin by giving ourselves to God, our souls and bodies, a living sacrifice wholly acceptable to God. "She hath done what she could." Is it true of us? Have we, and are we

giving the very best part to God? We cannot all be clever or eloquent or influential, but at the judgment day our Lord will not judge us for not having had great talents or not having accomplished as much as our neighbors, but for having left undone what we could have done. There is not one of us that cannot in some way make the world sweeter and better by our influence. How shall we do it? Let us keep our lives clean and sweet, and others will follow our examples. Let us never miss an opportunity to do a kind act, no matter how small. Many times we will feel we are making no progress because what we are able to do seems so little, but God knows our ability to do, and He is a just Judge and a merciful Father, and He will come at length to reckon with His laborers. After a famous victory of Napoleon's he gave to each of his faithful soldiers a medal, bearing this inscription, "I was there." That was enough; it needed no other word of praise; it was just to testify that the bearer had helped to win the victory by being there and doing his duty. And so if we do our best, just what each of us can, God will reward us, because we were taking our places in the battle of life, out in the daily struggle doing our best. We must do our utmost to help our fellow-men. There are plenty of dark and dangerous crossings in life over which we can help others; sometimes it would only take a little kindness on our part, but mean so very much to the one helped. These little acts done in loving service to God are the things really worth while, and to the doers thereof, will He say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

The man with this one talent was punished, not because he had done any harm with it, but because he had not used it at all. We may go through life without committing any grievous sins, but if we have never done any good to our neighbors nor sacrificed ourselves for God, we will stand empty handed before His throne on the great day when the secrets of all hearts are known.

"She hath done what she could." We should all do what we can to make others happy. There are so many ways of doing it. A kind act may seem a small thing to us as we do it, but it helps a life wounded by many thorns in its path and bruised by rough handling; it will be like tender hands binding up a wound; it will be the pouring of precious ointment, to bathe the aching feet. Blessed are they who comfort those in sorrow or make a frightened child happy or brighten by a cheerful word a lonely life or dis-appointed soul. It is an awful sin to willfully wound any one by a cruel word or harsh manner, and so often we do it carelessly, when if we would only bear in mind a desire to do all we can for God, we would have been able to encourage instead.

Let us visit the darkened rooms of sorrow like God's sunshine. Many of us remember the story of St. Veronica, who wiped the agonized face of Jesus with her handkerchief as He bore the cross and the features of the Saviour were pictured upon it. So let us try to get the image of Jesus on our lives and characters by using all our talents for Him.

What Wilhelm ought to do is to put himself in communication at once with The Colne, who entertains some views upon the question of peace between Nations which might be turned to good account in the Moroccan affair. The German Emperor has probably heard of how Panama was annexed; "I took Panama first and let Congress talk about it afterwards." Why shouldn't Wilhelm take Morocco in the same way and talk about it to the Frenchmen afterwards?

"Kansas is more progressive than ever," said Governor Stubbs the other day at the Conference of Governors at Spring Lake. Exhibit A: Stubbs. "Phoebus, Phoebus, what a name to fill the sounding trumpet of fame!"

The next annual convention of The Order of Redmen is to be held at Charleston, South Carolina, Governor Bleas having won this honor for that town by his impassioned eloquence at Cleveland on Wednesday. Something is always happening to Charleston—last year it voted for Bleas, this year it was visited by a cyclone and next year it is to have the Redmen under the auspices of Bleas.

## Voice of the People

Keep Dr. Carrington Where He Is. To The Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir,—I was very much interested in reading an article this morning, "What Dr. Carrington Has Done," signed by T. W. Murrell. It was a very strong article. I looked up some of the figures about the conditions at the Virginia State Penitentiary, and I find that of men in 1900 when Dr. Carrington was appointed, was 1,130, with thirty-seven deaths, the preceding year. In 1910 there were 1,232 men, and during this time the highest death rate for any one year, twelve, was reached, making an average death rate for the eight years of eight. This must speak very strongly for Dr. Carrington and what he has done for these poor servitors incarcerated in prison walls and absolutely dependent upon humane inclinations which may be shown them by the authorities.

Again, I may note that within the last two years J. R. Wood, the superintendent, with the co-operation of Dr. Carrington, instituted a moral code, the idea being to do away with the number of punishments which heretofore have been inflicted upon these men. In 1909, from February to September, the number of corporal punishments was 864. Institution of this honor system, we might call it, appeals to the obtunded morals of these poor creatures, and so reduced these punishments in 1910 for the same length of time to 153. These figures cannot be gainsaid, for certainly they show that some great good is being done somewhere in some way. It would seem that that man who would be

attitude and maintain discipline and order, and with all affectionate gratitude and profound respect of these inmates, would be the man to continue this work for which he seems to be, if we may judge from figures, so well equipped. I know both Dr. Carrington and Dr. Mann, both gentlemen of the highest standing in the medical profession in this city, but unless I considered myself peculiarly well equipped by virtue of several years of experience in handling this class of people, I hardly think I would venture to assume the responsibility of taking care of them. Dr. Carrington's work throughout the convalescent years has been one of a constant and progressive conscientiousness, and his judgment and experience alone have been worth untold dollars to the State. The institution of greater sanitary conditions, the bringing up of the general health of the settlement, means a greater number of days' work for the men incarcerated, and consequently less expense to the State outside. If these figures prove anything, if they carry any weight, I fail to see why political influence and personal prejudice would want at this time to make a change. I for one, had Dr. Carrington not done the good work that he has done, would be one of the first to want to oust him, but he has done even greater work than the worst sanguine could have expected. Why then should we want to change? I am writing from an impersonal standpoint, as it makes no difference to me personally who has the job, but I am actuated by what I consider to be of the best benefit and good to the prisoners.

Splendid Tribute to Dr. Carrington. To The Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir,—Since my return to the city from my summer vacation, I have read much in the daily papers with reference to the approaching election of the surgeon of the penitentiary. I have known Dr. Carrington for more than twenty years, and I am entitled to express my views. I have known Dr. Carrington intimately for more than twenty years, and I have been in close touch with his work at the State prison. He has

been prompt and regular in his attendance and capable and efficient in the treatment of his patients. He has shown great executive ability in the organization of the medical service, and while not lacking in discipline he has been kind and humane in the management of the unfortunate inmates. He has now had twenty years' experience in this rather unusual line of practice, and, in my opinion, it would be poor policy to substitute a new man in his place.

STUART MCGUIRE. Richmond, September 16.

For State Auditor. To The Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir,—It has been reported that Lee Moore, at present one of the clerks in the Auditor's office, will be a candidate for election as State Auditor. Whether the rumor is true or not, we are not advised, but there is very little doubt that Mr. Moore will be a candidate. The name of Colonel Eugene C. Massie has been mentioned by some prospective members of the Legislature as a man admirably fitted for this position, both by education, temperament and general capacity. We believe that a strong effort will be made to induce Colonel Massie to become a candidate for this office, and it is to be hoped that no member of the Legislature will pledge himself to any candidate at this time.

DEMOCRAT. Charlottesville.

Protests. To The Editor of The Times-Dispatch: Sir,—Smithfield ham seems to be a perennial inspiration to you from your frequent editorials on that subject. Your brains must be in a stomach instead of your head. You had better revise your figures on the toe utterly after S. ham go, instead of 1,656,385, as you give it, the United States census gives it 742,271 for 1910. It is the first named figure in the population of Louisiana, of course, your figures on the vote are necessarily wrong. Give us less gush on ham and more accuracy in figures. C. J. FORSTH. Richmond.

DEMANDS ON SPAIN MADE BY GERMANY.

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENAY. SECRETS have been phenomenally well kept in connection with the Andalusian problem, and, so far as I am aware, no mention has been made of the demands made by Germany upon Spain, for the latter's last remaining African colonies. It may be recalled that if Germany precipitated the present crisis, by sending warships to Agadir, she did so on the pretext that Spain had sent troops to El Kaar and to Larach, with the intention of occupying the district in order to protect Spanish life and interests. Germany declared that Spain had done this by virtue of a secret treaty with France, concluded when Theophile Delcasse was Minister of Foreign Affairs, and which, concluded by the Algeiras Conference, provided for a partition of the Moorish Empire between France and Spain. The warships were sent to Agadir to see that Germany got her share in the partition. Subsequently it became known that King Alfonso had sent his troops to El Kaar at the secret instigation of Germany, in order to give the latter a pretext to go to Agadir.

The Kaiser now demands, as the price of his withdrawal from Agadir, compensation, not alone from France on the shores of the Congo, but also from Spain, on the ground of the Delcasse secret treaty between France and Spain, which, if Germany retreats, will leave these two nations free to become the preponderant powers in Morocco. The compensation which Emperor William has attempted to exact from King Alfonso, in order to recognize Spain's right to a free hand in that portion of Morocco accorded to her by the Delcasse secret treaty, is the Spanish territory of the Rio Muni, on the Gulf of Guinea, extending from the Muni to the Camero River, and the German Cameroons; also the island of Fernando Po, and even the Canaries group.

Now Spain long ago gave to France the right of pre-emption in the case of the sale of any of her African colonies, or adjacent islands, and France would not permit of any surrender of these dependencies to Germany, while England would probably prefer even war with Germany, to seeing her es- sential ally, Fernando Po, or in the Canaries. It is these pretensions of Germany to Spain's African possessions, which are creating so much trouble in the negotiations which are now in progress between Berlin, Paris and London, in the hope of averting war.

We have been seeing a great deal during the past week of dispatches of the financial crisis created by the financial powers of France, in calling in gold, and above all in calling in money loaned to Germany for industrial purposes. Few people, however, have any idea of the enormous power of the money market of London, and more especially of Paris, in determining matters of international policy. In fact, the two money markets, those of Paris and of London, working as they do generally in unison, may be said to dominate the world.

It is not an exaggeration to say that this no exaggeration is shown by an incident which occurred during the Russian war with Japan. There was a time when almost every day brought news of some fresh disaster to Moscow; and so great was the popular alarm created thereby, that the bears determined to take advantage thereof to create a panic, which would have the effect of throwing upon the market for sale, at a ruinous price, all those millions upon millions of Russian securities held in France.

This panic, largely engineered by Cremen houses, which were anxious then, as now, to embitter the relations of France and Russia, and to put an end to the alliance between the two countries, was nipped in the bud by M. Maurice de Verneuil, president of the Agents de Change, that is to say, of the board of some two or three score stockholders who under government charter, have the monopoly of stockbroking in France. M. de Verneuil, without even consulting the board—there was no time for that—

issued a decree that no Russian stocks should be dealt with on margin on the Paris Bourse. That ended all speculation, and consequently all possibility of a panic. It may have been despotism, but it saved Russia from the ruin of her credit, both at home and abroad, and France from a veritable financial cataclysm, since the majority of Russian stocks are held by the small investors of France.

Every tourist from the United States visiting Paris, and well nigh every American racing man, knows of Malmaison La Fayette, the locality owes its importance as one of the most important racing centres in the vicinity of the French metropolis, a sort of Gallic Newmarket, where many of the leading figures on the French turf keep their racing stables. Few of them, however, know anything about the history of the locality, or of its original vogue and importance. The chateau, or rather palace, is one of the most perfect examples of the architecture of the seventeenth century, and was built between 1642 and 1661, by Rene de Longueuil, on his estate known as Malmaison, which had already been in his Norman family for two centuries at the time. He was one of the principal lieutenants and favorites of Cardinal Richelieu, and held the office of superintendent, or rather Minister of Finance of France, under that great statesman. Louis XIV. was staying at the chateau of Malmaison, (the name by which it was known until 1815.) In 1671, when Bosquet brought to him the news of the death of the Duc d'Anjou.

St. Simon, in his Memoirs, gives a graphic description of the De Longueuil estate known as Malmaison, and it was at the chateau that, later on, as the guest of an eighteenth century Rene de Longueuil, Voltaire gave his first reading of the "Henriade," that he wrote his tragedy entitled "Marianne," that he almost succumbed to a severe attack of smallpox, and during his convalescence nearly burned the place down, by allowing the chimney to catch fire. Not long afterwards this Rene de Longueuil, who first planted coffee in France, and who through his knowledge of chemistry succeeded in developing the most perfect Prussian blue known, ever seen in Europe, also had smallpox, and succeeded in being deeply mourned by Voltaire.

In 1777, King Louis XVI's younger brother, the Comte d'Artois, (afterwards Charles X.) purchased the Chateau de Malmaison, and during the subsequent twelve years, Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette were frequent visitors at the chateau. Condemned by the Revolution, on the overthrow of the monarchy, it was sold at public auction, to an army contractor of the name of Lauchere, from whom it was bought by Marshal Lannes, Duc de Montebello. He caused the entire park to be planted with poplar trees, in strategic lines, in remembrance of the victories in which he had participated. During his occupancy, and also after his death during the tenancy of his widow, the chateau was frequently visited by Emperor Napoleon, and after the latter's downfall, by Czar Alexander I. and by the other allied monarchs who assisted in the restoration of the Bourbons. In 1815 it was purchased from the widowed Duchesse de Montebello, by the banker Jacques Laffitte, and it was within its walls that he plotted with Thiers, Miguet, and Beranger, the Revolution of 1830, and the advent to the throne of the Orleans dynasty, in the person of King Louis Philippe.

During Laffitte's ownership it became known as Malmaison Laffitte, mainly owing to his establishment in the park of a race track, and racing centre. After Laffitte, it was owned by the Duc de Bojano, and then by a Russian, M. Grommey, on whose death it was bought by a real estate dealer, who was about to tear down the chateau and sell it for building material, to fill up the moat, and to convert the entire place into a colony of cheap suburban villas, when fortunately the government intervened and purchased the chateau, and a considerable portion of the park, for use as a museum of French art of the seventeenth century; of the tapestries, the furniture, the jewelry, the paintings, and the sculptures of that age, so prolific in art treasures.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Company.)

## Banking by Mail

Many of the depositors in the National State and City Bank who do not live in Richmond send their deposits by mail.

We should be very glad to have YOU write us to-day for full information regarding this department of our business.

## National State and City Bank

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

CAPITAL \$1,000,000.00  
 SURPLUS 600,000.00

WM. H. PALMER, President.  
 JNO. S. ELLETT, Vice-President.  
 WM. M. HILL, Vice-President.  
 J. W. SINTON, Vice-President.  
 JULIEN H. HILL, Cashier.